

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **09 April 2010** (hereinafter “Office Action”), Examiner reviewed claims 1, 3-4, 6-12, 14-15, 17-23, 25-26 and 28-33. Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-12, 14-23, and 25-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Reed et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,345,288 hereinafter “Reed”), Bischoff et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,718,377 hereinafter “Bischoff”), and Zintel (U.S. Patent No. 6,779,004, hereinafter “Zintel”).

Examiner Interview

Applicant thanks Examiner for the telephone interview conducted on 12 May 2010. Applicant proposed amendments to the claims and argued that the cited references Reed, Bischoff, and Zintel do not disclose a universal data transfer interface comprising object-oriented mobile code, which is transmitted between a plurality of components and executed instructions on the component to facilitate file access and printing to the components. Examiner agrees that the proposed amendments overcome the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant has incorporated the proposed amendments into this response.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-12, 14-23, and 25-33 as being unpatentable over Reed, Bischoff, and Zintel. Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections, because none of Reed, Bischoff, and Zintel discloses a universal data transfer interface comprising **object-oriented mobile code, which is transmitted between a plurality of components and executed instructions on the component** to facilitate file access and printing to the components.

Specifically, embodiments of the present invention provide a system for facilitating a universal data transfer interface comprising object-oriented **mobile code**, which is transmitted between a plurality of components and executed instructions on the component to facilitate file access and printing to the

components prior to initiating a data transfer (see instant application, paragraphs [0018] and [0035]).

In rejecting the above features, Examiner avers that Zintel discloses a description document including a declaration of methods that may be implemented in a variety of different object-oriented programming language such as CORBA or Java classes, citing to Zintel column 21, lines 56-64 (see Office Action, page 5). However, the cited sections of Zintel merely disclose a programmatic interface – the Rehydrator, which obtains the description document to interact with controlled devices (see Zintel, column 21, lines 56-64). This programming interface, albeit object oriented, is not **mobile code**, because it cannot be transferred between systems and executed on another system without explicit installation to facilitate file system access and printing. Moreover, nowhere in Reed or Bischoff discloses a universal data transfer interface comprising object-oriented mobile code, which is transmitted between a plurality of components and executed instructions on the component.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, 12, 19, 23, and 30 to clarify that embodiments of the present invention discloses a universal data transfer interface comprising object-oriented mobile code, which is transmitted between a plurality of components and executed instructions on the component to facilitate file access and printing to the components. These amendments find support in paragraphs [0018] and [0035] of the instant application. Applicant has also amended claims 3-4, 7, 9-10, 14-15, and 25-26 to correct antecedence basis. Applicant has cancelled claims 6, 17, and 28 without prejudice. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, 12, 19, 23, and 30 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-4 and 7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 9-11, which depend upon claim 8, claims 14-15 and 18, which depend upon claim 12, claims 20-22, which depend upon claim 19, claims 25-26 and 29, which depend upon claim 23, and claims 31-33, which depend upon claim 30, are for the same

reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Ying Wang/
Ying Wang
Registration No. 63,786

/Shun Yao/
Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 09 July 2010

Ying Wang
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 204-4051
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: annie@parklegal.com

Shun Yao
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com